



DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Washington, D.C. 20520

October 25, 1977

TO : Members, IS Working Group  
FROM : D.H. McCabe *Qjm*  
SUBJECT: Investigative Standards Project

The working group met at the IC Staff offices on October 21, 1977. Army, Navy, Air Force, DIA, CIA, FBI, Treasury, State, and the IC Staff attended.

I briefed members on the latest draft of the son of E.O. 10450, which apparently is now before the CSC Commissioners for approval. The next step will be to return it to OMB, which then will probably pass it on to the agencies for comment, although this is not a certainty. The draft, we believe, is also before the President's Reorganization Project. Since most members had not seen this latest draft, I am attaching a copy. Please pardon my notes on the draft. I am also attaching my own informal observations on the draft.

The group discussed how best to continue the study project. Some seem to feel we have done enough on scope. I believe, however, we have only begun. We must now refine our data collection format, adopt a statistically sound technique of selecting samples (to avoid the prospect of having to analyze every case), and we must finally come up with a simpler way to collate the data. Our objectives should be to present data on a more or less continuing basis, much the same way we presented it in our pilot project. I believe we should also try to include data from cases which cover at least the theoretical 15 years and, if possible, cases which cover the entire adult life. These, possibly selected at random rather than covering all cases, should serve as a control group against which our less extensive cases can be compared.

Our next step should be to refine the data form and to refine the categories of significant information. It was noted that some tend to overlap

-2-

one another. For example, we use separate categories for theft or drug violations and for criminal records. But that was intentional; we wanted to identify more specifically what kinds of criminal activity adjudicators find relevant, reserving the criminal record category for less relevant types of data and emphasizing it as the source rather than the type of data. I will send you proposed revisions of the data sheets in the next week or so.

We also discussed a proposal to carry out the Committee's mandate to examine the actual adjudication process, to determine what types of activity or personal characteristic adjudicators find relevant to a decision and what factors can influence their evaluations. It was proposed that each member offer ideas on specific hypothetical situations, in each major area, such as drugs, foreign connections, immorality, impaired judgment, dishonesty--each of the categories on the initial data collection sheet. We will then select representative examples and survey the adjudicators (or policy staffs) to determine how significant each item might be to a decision, what circumstances might aggravate or mitigate each item, and what additional data might be necessary to a firm decision.

We agreed to meet again at the IC Staff offices at 0930, November 7, 1977.

Attachments:  
as stated